

GOVERNMENT

A - Council

COUNCIL POLICY NO. A-1

TITLE: COUNCIL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

POLICY: See attachment.

REFERENCE: City Council Goals - January 31, 2000; dated 1/31/2000 (Agenda Item 4.2.j)

CITY OF SALEM

Council Goal-Setting Work session

January 31, 2000

Meeting Notes

IN ATTENDANCE: Mayor Mike Swaim, Ann Gavin-Sample, Bill Smaldone, Paul Wulf, Wes Bennett, Don Scott, Bob Wallace, Glenn Wheeler, Larry Wacker, Bob Wells, Stephanie Smythe, Bill Healy, Ed Jochums, George Shelley, Casey Jones, John Elegant, Connie Wiggins, Walt Myers, and Frank Mauldin and Dan Bender, Statesman Journal Reporter.

On Monday January 31, 2000, the Salem City Council conducted a goal-setting and work-planning session. The session was facilitated by Sue Dicile of Management Resources, Portland, Oregon. The following notes were taken from the notes taken on chart-pak during the session.

CITY OVERVIEW: Key Trends, Issues, and Challenges

City facing financial shortfall. Council members agreed that the City is faced with an endemic, long-term funding shortfall and that revenue enhancement strategies must be sought, although it was noted that in order to garner public acceptance, the dialog must include cost containment sensitivity and strategies. That the City of Salem has a history of difficulty convincing voters to bring on revenue-enhancing strategies was also noted. The Revenue Task Force will deliver its recommendations to the Council in February.

Zoning. “NIMBY-ism” was one of the difficulties noted in the discussion on the issue of zoning. Council members agreed that there is a need to buffer the impact of growth and increased density on neighborhoods. They noted the perception of zoning code rigidity and the need for flexibility on some types of zoning requirements. It was stated that overly rigid code puts the diverse mix that's valued in Salem neighborhoods at risk.

Growth. Council members agreed that some level of growth must be accommodated, but that it must be strategically managed. It was noted that the costs of growth, and the costs of no-growth, are unknown, as is information on the trends of growth costs. It was noted that there are both qualitative and quantitative impacts to growth, and that both aspects need to be examine. A Question was raised about “who” is driving growth, and whether growth is caused by newcomers to the area, or the natural growth that occurs when families remain in an area over generations. It was noted that one of the negative implications of growth-limiting policies is the difficulties created for young people wishing to remain in the area. Council members agreed that there are a broad range of City decisions that will be predicted on the approach of managing growth.

Downtown urban renewal initiatives. It was noted that a variety of initiatives, all of which will require funding, are upcoming for analysis, discussion, prioritization, and management.

ESA listing. It was noted that the ESA listings will limit urban policy choices.

Housing affordability/home ownership affordability. It was noted that costs of housing, and particularly of home ownership, have seen a dramatic rise in the area, and like other growth-related issues, will have impact on the ability of families and young people to remain in the area.

Maintenance on infrastructure being deferred. It was noted that the city may be accruing a significant liability for deferred infrastructure maintenance.

Youth Issues. It was noted that youth-related problems such as youth crime are growing, and that recreation options for youth are limited in the City.

“Adult” businesses. It was noted that there a high percentage per capita of “adult” businesses in Salem, and that the inability to impact the zoning of such businesses is a frustration to residents.

Lack of participation in government. It was noted that although there are many local activists in the City, there is a significant percentage of residents who are not involved with, or who feel a sense of disenfranchisement from local government. A question was raised as to whether the costs of public service, in terms of both dollars and time, exclude the majority from participation.

Public safety. It was noted that public safety resources and facilities lack full coordination across jurisdiction boundaries. A question about the age, condition, and earthquake readiness of existing facilities was also raised.

Emergency response. It was noted that the capabilities and adequacy of the City's emergency response system is “unknown”.

Legislative liaison. Council members agreed that the City lacks adequate communication with, and advocacy in, the legislature. Council members further agreed that the loss of City's liaison to the legislature due to cuts in the City budget, may have resulted in the loss of more revenue than if the position had been maintained. It was noted that advocacy and relationship-building in the legislature must “start early”, well in advance of the opening of the legislative session. Several approaches were discussed, including reinstatement of the position, hiring a consultant to legislative liaison work, working through the Oregon League of Cities, or garnering commitment from Council members to spend a percentage of their time doing legislative liaison functions.

Conference Center. It was noted that there is a strong push from sectors within the City to establish a conference center in order to compete with other cities. It was further noted that a conference center proposal will be brought before the Council this year.

Fairgrounds property. It was noted that talks are going on at the State level regarding the future of the fairgrounds property. Council members agreed that the Council should discuss this item and develop the City's perspective with regard to uses of the property.

Federal and state roads funding. It was noted that federal and state funding for roads is available and that the Council should be considering those sources.

HALLMARKS OF COUNCIL'S VISION FOR THE CITY: 5-10-Year Horizon

- **Financial stability established.**
- **Quality of life maintained.**
Council members agreed that quality of life standards include:
 - Parks in all neighborhoods.
 - Available swimming facilities.
 - Clean air and water.
 - Reduced crime.
 - Economic viability.
 - Trees.
 - Restored Library services.
- **Affordable housing available.** Council members agreed that there needs to be quality standards for the development of affordable housing, and that the definition of “affordable housing availability” should address both the quantity and quality of such housing.
- **Better access to transit alternatives.** Concern about traffic congestion, and the need for better access to transit alternatives, was noted.

OTHER ITEMS

Capacity. The facilitator requested that Council members evaluate their own and city staff capacity to take on new projects. Council members noted that they are unable to clearly evaluate between new and existing projects. City staff noted that there is little unused capacity, given the existing project workload, and that the adoption of new projects will mean that those projects are put in the queue until other projects are completed, or that existing projects are extended or put on hold to accommodate new work.

Scope of the cost-benefit analysis on annexation. It was noted that the cost-benefit analysis, as proposed, addresses costs and benefits to the City only. Some members of the Council expressed concern about that limitation and asked whether information on costs and benefits for other jurisdictions could be included. City staff noted that there is no in-city capacity to develop an analysis that is expanded to other jurisdictions but that it could be done via additional consultant services. It was noted that the purview of the Council, with regard to addressing cost/benefit issues relative to other jurisdictions, is limited.

The role schools and the School District in determining costs and benefits of annexations was discussed. It was noted that there is an upcoming meeting with the School District regarding the size of the urban service area.

A question was raised about the role of existing cost-of-growth information that has been developed by other organizations or jurisdictions. It was noted that such information is available, but not fully applicable to Salem.

At the conclusion of the discussion Council members agreed that analysis relative to transit and schools should be left out of the scope of work for the City's study.

INITIATIVES TIME LINE

Initiatives	2 nd Qtr 2000	3 rd Qtr 2000	4 th Qtr 2000		2001
Riverfront Downtown Urban Renewal (Priority Spending)	Projected priorities weighed and financing approach determined				
Annexation & Cost Benefit Analysis	Council discussion on scope of work drafted by staff	Proceed with study Hire consultant	Study delivered	Action: December, 2000	
Transportation Bond	Ongoing				
Public Safety Bond Issue	Work session on major projects	Proceed with: None, one, or both	Approval of Resolution		
Sewer COSA	(Stormwater Master Plan) Ongoing				
Capital Improvement Plan Conference Center West Salem Urban Service Area Public Construction Projects					
Labor Negotiations (3 bargaining Units)	Keep apprised				
Revenue-Limiting Ballot Initiatives	Keep apprised of issues and options		Frame Council position. Don't overstate		
Obtain Legal Guidelines on Placement of Group Homes			Guidelines Reviewed		
Support initiative on Zoning Adult Businesses			Letter of support from Council	Consider appropriate measures (if passed)	
Zoning Flexibility		Obtain staff recommendation to fund in 00-01.			
Fund Enhanced Legislative Efforts with Contiguous Jurisdictions		Staff evaluate and report on approaches	Fund in 2000-2001.		